

THE DAILY JOURNAL.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1888.

WASHINGTON OFFICE—513 Fourteenth St.
F. S. BEATT, Correspondent.NEW YORK OFFICE—104 Temple Court,
Corner Beekman and Nassau streets.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

One year, without Sunday.....\$12.00
One year, with Sunday.....14.00
Six months, without Sunday.....7.00
Six months, with Sunday.....8.00
Three months, without Sunday.....3.50
Three months, with Sunday.....4.00
One month, without Sunday.....1.00
One month, with Sunday.....1.20

Per year.....\$1.00
Reduced Rates to Clubs.

Subscribers to any of our numerous agents, or send subscriptions to
THE JOURNAL NEWSPAPER COMPANY,
INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

THE INDIANAPOLIS JOURNAL.

Can be found at the following places:
LONDON—American Exchange in Europe, 440 Strand.

PARIS—American Exchange in Paris, 35 Boulevard des Capucines.

NEW YORK—Giles House and Windsor Hotel.

PHILADELPHIA—A. P. Kemble, 3735 Lancaster avenue.

CHICAGO—Palmer House.

CINCINNATI—J. P. Hawley & Co., 154 Vine street.

LOUISVILLE—C. T. Deering, northwest corner Third and Jefferson streets.

ST. LOUIS—Union News Company, Union Depot and Southern Hotel.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Biggs House and Exhibit House.

Telephone Calls.
Business Office.....238; Editorial Rooms.....242

"We demand tariff reform and we set our faces in the direction of free trade."

"The Democrat who is not a free-trader should go elsewhere."

"The conflict between free trade and protection is irrepressible and must be fought out to the bitter end. We spit upon compromise and propose rather to ask not to give quarter."

"The Democrat party, except in the person of imbeciles hardly worth mentioning, is not upon the fence. It is a free-trade party or it is nothing."

"There can be no cooked-up platform and no compromise candidate."

"The black flag is up. No quarter will be asked and no quarter given."—Extracts from Lewis Wallace's letters and editorials in the Louisville Courier-Journal.

The fool New York Herald has ceased asking "Who is Harrison?"

"We are glad to get any aid we can in the work of the campaign," says Si Sheerin. Does Mr. Sheerin mean this as an acknowledgment that he will father the slanders against General Harrison?

It is about time for the committee of one hundred to be getting itself in shape to look after the perpetrators of election frauds. Indications are that other Democrats are putting themselves in danger of going the way of Coy and Bernhamer.

Will Mr. Chairman Jewett favor the public with a fac-simile of the receipt given by an inexperienced country lawyer for \$20,000, the amount of a retainer paid said lawyer by parties to a suit pending before a court of which a relative of the lucky attorney happened to be the judge? There is a campaign document that would prove a sensation.

When the New York mugwumps announced that they would support Warner Miller for Governor as against Hill they were evidently under the impression that Mr. Miller would modify his tariff views in accordance with their own. At least, such is the inference to be drawn from their lamentations over his strong protection speeches. The lot of the mugwump this year is, indeed, an unhappy one.

President Cleveland issued a certificate of character to John R. Fellows when the latter was candidate for district attorney, and Mr. Hill's friends are grumbling because he fails to do as much for the candidate for Governor. They seem to forget that Mr. Fellows is an ex-rebel, for all of whom the President has a tender side, and that Mr. Hill has no such recommendation.

The Journal desires once more to observe that Anna Dickinson has stirred up the moss-back Democrats with a red-hot poker. And the same may be said of Senators Chandler and Spooner in the Senate of the United States yesterday. It is high time the swaggering, bullying, Democratic ex-confederates were being taught that Republicans and Northern people have some rights they are bound to respect.

The Republicans of Indiana were never more earnest or enthusiastic than they are at present, but more earnestness and enthusiasm do not win victories. There must be organization, co-operation, personal canvassing and hard work. The committees have a great responsibility in this regard, and every Republican in the State should bear a helping hand. Are you who read this paragraph doing your duty individually?

The Philadelphia Press is of the opinion that "little reliance can be placed on the statements of a paper which is partly owned and edited by an ex-whisky ring speculator, and which does not attempt to deny the repeated charge, made conspicuous in the editorial columns of the New York World, that it offers to sell space in its news columns to so much an inch." The paper referred to is, as might be supposed, some obscure publication of the Democratic slums, but is that well-known organ of the imbeciles, the New York Post. It is not necessary, however, to inquire into the antecedents of its editor or the character of its management, to learn that the Post is an unscrupulous, mendacious and malignantly partisan sheet. The occasional reader of its columns soon discovers that fact without assistance.

If any one thinks one thousand dollars too large a fee for the services of three lawyers like Harrison, Hines & Miller, during a week of important litigation, what would he think of a retainer of \$20,000 paid to a young and inexperienced country lawyer who performed no service at all, but who happened to have a relative on the bench of the court in which a suit they were interested in was pending? When Chairman Jewett returns, and can get a little time from the work of circulating lies or

forgeries against General Harrison, probably he will give any anxious inquirer his opinion on the subject. The Journal begs to suggest to him that a fac-simile of the young lawyer's receipt for the princely fee would be a good campaign document just at this juncture.

GENERAL HARRISON.

Of the many remarkable features of the present campaign there is none more remarkable than General Harrison's growth in the public estimation since his nomination. The campaign is destined to be a remarkable one in many respects. The remarkable development of American feeling, the unexpected prominence given to the national flag, the revival of the patriotic memories of the war, the enthusiasm of the old men who were voters in 1836 and 1840, the still greater enthusiasm of the young first voters, fully four-fifths of whom are Republicans, are some of the salient features of a campaign which is without parallel in recent times. Not even in the memorable campaign of 1860, when the Republican party achieved its first national victory under the leadership of the martyred Lincoln, were the evidences of individual conviction, popular enthusiasm and local activity more apparent than they are at present.

But none of these features, nor all of them combined, tend more to individualize the campaign and differentiate it from all others than the steady and remarkable manner in which General Harrison has continued to grow in the estimation of the public, from the day of his nomination to the present. Three months ago, when the Indiana delegation and his other friends at Chicago were urging his nomination they put it on the ground of his availability, his high character and great ability, his true and tried Republicanism, and his spotless record as a soldier, citizen and statesman. To such as had not closely observed General Harrison's career, or who were not informed as to his intellectual and moral qualities, his friends gave strong assurance that he was eminently qualified for the presidential office, and would meet the highest expectations that could be formed of him as a candidate and leader. At that time it could hardly be said that General Harrison had a national reputation in the sense of being widely and almost universally known, and it was not surprising that some curiosity should exist as to what manner of man the Hoosiers were so earnestly and enthusiastically pressing for the nomination. The Hoosiers knew their man, and were not backward about endorsing him. Knowing that if nominated he would meet every requirement of the position and every expectation of the party, they had no hesitation in giving the strongest possible assurances on this score. How safe they were in doing so let the record of the last three months decide. How completely General Harrison has justified the representations at Chicago of those who knew him best, let his present standing before the American people determine. No man ever grew more rapidly in public estimation than General Harrison has during the last three months, and no candidate ever more completely vindicated the wisdom of a convention's choice. Few men and few characters can stand the ordeal of being placed on such a pedestal, standing for months in the fierce light that beats on a presidential nominee, a target for calumny as well as criticism, without disclosing some weakness or defect. Power still can pass through the far more trying ordeal of receiving thousands upon thousands of visitors and making scores of speeches to acres upon acres of people, touching more or less directly on nearly every phase of public affairs, without making a single mistake that his enemies can seize upon, or saying a single thing that his friends could wish unsaid. In this respect General Harrison's candidacy is unique and unparalleled. He has already made more than sixty speeches since his nomination, and not a dull one in the entire number, nor a single error. The gifted Garfield was not called upon to make so many speeches, and he certainly did not make better ones, and we do not forget the great speeches of Mr. Blaine. General Harrison's speeches show something more than a mere gift of oratory. They reveal the quality of his mind, the sincerity and strength of his convictions, the breadth and catholicity of his views, the warmth and fervor of his feelings, his fine imagination and his lofty patriotism. This is not flattery; it is in the mouths of millions, the common talk of the country. Thus it is that General Harrison, without any self-seeking or ostentatious effort on his part, merely by meeting, to the fullest extent, the requirements of his position and the drafts made upon him by the Republican party, has fulfilled every prediction of his friends and won the unbounded admiration of millions of his countrymen. Where he sits is the head of the table, and he is still growing.

SHAMELESS AND SHAMEFUL.

"Do not understand, however, that I am disposed to repudiate the matter. We are glad to get any aid we can in the work of the campaign, and I have no doubt the men who make the charges believe them to be true."

This is what Mr. Simon P. Sheerin, member of the Democratic national committee, and local manager for Indiana, says concerning the false and forged "dollar-a-day" lie that is being extensively circulated. Those who invented it know it is a lie out of the whole cloth, and Mr. Sheerin either knows the same, or might know it if he wished to know the truth. But he says "mind, we do not repudiate the matter, we are glad to get any aid we can in the work of the campaign." We doubt if the history of politics could show a more shameless confession than this. What difference is there, morally, between stealing and profiting by a theft, between lying and profiting by a lie? When Mr. Sheerin says: "We are glad to get any aid we can in the campaign," he extends a cordial invitation to professional liars, forgers, black-mailers and jail-birds generally to report for duty as volunteer aids on the staff of the Democratic committee. We are happy to say the Republican campaign is not conducted on that principle. The same class of men who forge these lies concerning General Harrison could be hired to make affidavits that Cleveland beats his wife when he is drunk, or that he tried to poison his mother-

in-law to get the family fortune, or that he left Buffalo without paying his liquor bills, and these charges would be just as true as those which are printed and circulated against General Harrison. But the Republican party is not seeking that kind of "aid" in the work of the campaign. Forgers and perjurers are referred to Democratic headquarters, and Mr. Sheerin extends an open invitation to them to call and extend their "aid."

COLONEL MATSON AGAINST PENSIONS.

Indiana is being flooded with copies of a printed speech by Colonel Matson on pension bills which purports to have been delivered in the House of Representatives on the 28th of July, 1888. The speech, though printed in the Congressional Record, and circulated as a public document under Colonel Matson's frank, was never delivered in the House. In this respect it is no more fraudulent than some other speeches, but it is not fraudulent in this respect alone. It is an attempt to prove that the Democrats in Congress and the present administration are pre-eminently the soldier's friend. In this respect the speech is in keeping with Colonel Matson's established character as a tricky politician and demagogue. It is simply a campaign document, cunningly framed to deceive the old soldiers and whitewash the record of the Democratic party on the pension question. Colonel Matson himself, as chairman of the committee on invalid pensions, has prevented pension legislation as effectually as if he had been put there for that purpose, as, probably, he was. It is as true now as it was in 1880, when a Democratic member of Congress from Pennsylvania wrote to one of his old soldier constituents that "with the present Democratic House pension bills do not have much favor."

The member added, with more frankness than discretion, so far as his party was concerned, that "it has become almost impossible to get consideration of such a bill at all, and when considered, its chance of passing the House is very remote. Democratic opposition to pension legislation for years past has been stealthy and insidious but none the less determined and effective. The entire pension system is the work of the Republican party, and there is not a pension law on the statute books but has been passed over the open or secret opposition of the Democracy. Every pension law and every section and provision of every law favorable to pensioners is due to the Republican party. Colonel Matson claims great credit for the present administration because the Pension Office has continued to administer the law enacted by Republicans. The administration would not have dared to do otherwise, and would have been subject to impeachment if it had. The record shows that on the dependent pension bill, passed by the Forty-ninth Congress, 114 Republicans voted for it and not one against it, while only 66 Democrats voted for it and 76 against it. On the vote to pass it over the President's veto, 138 Republicans voted for and not one against it, while 37 Democrats voted for and 125 against it. It was on the question of passing this bill over the President's veto that Congressman Bragg, a Democratic member from Wisconsin, said in a speech in the House:

"Who were the majority of those men that found themselves in the service of the United States from December, 1861, to February, 1865, that Congress should sit up nights to pass pensions to provide for them? They were the sons of the earth. * * * These men [referring to Union soldiers] that go to the poor-house are native there; they are dropped there by the hand of fate; they have got no enterprise; they have got no self-respect; they have got no character. They lie down and open their mouths for a test to suck, and it does not make much matter what animal has the test so long as they can suck anything from it."

The man who uttered this libel on the old soldiers is now United States minister to Mexico.

The committee on invalid pensions, of which Colonel Matson, a quasi-soldier, is chairman, has been the grave-yard of pension bills. During the present session to refer a pension bill to that committee has been to consign it to the tomb of the Capulets. About one hundred and fifty general pension, service pension and arrears-of-pension bills have been referred to that committee to be heard from no more. In that Democratic committee, with Colonel Matson as chairman, they have been smothered, strangled and done to death. In his pretended speech, which was never delivered in the House, Colonel Matson essays a defense of the President's vetoes of private pension bills, saying: "I challenge any of his loud accusers to show any single instance in which he has annulled unnecessarily against the claimant." Colonel Matson shows more reckless bravery in this challenge than he ever did as a soldier. He never defended a position during the war as stubbornly as he now defends Grover Cleveland's vetoes of pension bills. He says the President "never annulled unnecessarily against the claimant."

Has he heard of the case of Lieut. Clinton D. Smith, of Winchester, Ind., who suffered eighteen years of excruciating torture from a gun-shot wound, and whose widow's pension the President vetoed with a brutal insinuation that the deceased soldier was addicted to morphine?

Has Colonel Matson ever heard that in vetoing the pension of Alfred Denry, who swore that he was permanently injured by being thrown forward on the pommel of his saddle, the President said: "The number of instances in which those of our soldiers who rode horses during the war were injured by being thrown forward on their saddles indicates that those saddles were very dangerous contrivances?"

Has Colonel Matson ever heard that in vetoing the pension of John W. Ferris the President said: "The ingenuity developed in the constant and persistent attacks upon the public treasury by those claiming pensions, and in the increase of those already granted, is exhibited in bold relief by this attempt to include sore eyes among the results of diarrheas?"

Has Colonel Matson ever heard that in vetoing the pension of Andrew L. Wilson the President said: "Whatever else may be said of this claimant's achievements during his short military career, it must be conceded that he accumulated a great deal of disability?"

Has Colonel Matson ever heard that in several instances the President, not content

with vetoing pensions to gallant soldiers, has gone out of his way to charge them with having been habitual drunkards?

Perhaps, however, Colonel Matson has heard of these cases and approves of the language and spirit of the vetoes. Perhaps he thinks they do not "annul" unnecessarily against the claimant." He has said so in the speech which he never delivered in the House, but which is being circulated in Indiana with that lie printed on its title page.

A COUPLE OF INNOCENTS.

Mr. Thomas Taggart and Mr. Si P. Sheerin are too innocent to be allowed to run at large without guardians. They both affect to know nothing about the lies and forgeries that are being circulated against General Harrison in the interest, at least, of the Democratic party, of whose campaign they are supposed to be official and responsible managers. Mr. Sheerin is reported to say of the "dollar-a-day" story, that—

"I neither assume responsibility for the charges nor repudiate them. The thing is entirely outside the Democratic organization."

Now, Mr. Sheerin, is it true that "the thing is entirely outside the Democratic organization?"

The "thing"—a very proper term—has been displayed on the transparencies of every Democratic parade made in this city, for which parades "the Democratic organization" has been directly responsible, in the person of Mr. Thomas Taggart, the chairman of the Democratic county central committee. This Mr. Sheerin knows, if he knows anything.

The "thing" has been, and is being, circulated by irresponsible persons who have been, and are now, in the employ of "the Democratic organization," and this Mr. Sheerin knows, if he knows anything.

The "thing" has been printed in the columns of the Indianapolis Sentinel, the recognized organ of "the Democratic organization" in this city, county and State, and thousands of copies of the Sentinel containing the "thing" have been circulated and paid for by "the Democratic organization," probably out of the funds in the hands of or controlled by Mr. Si P. Sheerin himself. This Mr. Sheerin knows, if he knows anything.

Mr. Sheerin cannot divest himself of "the Democratic organization" of responsibility for the "thing." "The Democratic organization" has made itself responsible for the "thing," and so soon as it had done so beyond question, the Journal put the matter in such shape that the Democratic managers must publicly assume their responsibility, or as publicly disown their bastard falsehood.

Mr. Sheerin has said "the Democratic organization" is ready to accept the aid of the "thing," or any other sort of lie, slander, libel, perjury or forgery that may be or can be dreamed of or concocted. He has advertised to all grades of political criminals and scoundrels, that "the Democratic organization," of which he is the highest local official representative, stands ready to welcome any "aid" that may come to it, and then he proposes to wash his hands of responsibility by saying, when his lie is driven to the wall, that "the thing is entirely outside of the Democratic organization." The course of Pontius Pilate on a certain notable occasion seems to have suggested to Mr. Si P. Sheerin a convenient method of easing his conscience and cleansing his hands. It will be recalled that the expedient of the Roman politician was not a remarkable success.

COME TO THE FRONT.

We challenge any reputable or responsible Democrat to father the "dollar-a-day" lie that is being circulated. They dare not do it. They prefer to act the part of a "fence" among sneak-thieves, handling and disposing of goods stolen by others. The Journal has nothing to do with brainless and characterless scamps or irresponsible liars and liabers; but if any responsible person or representative of any responsible organization, on behalf of the Democratic party, will come to the front and father this lie we will give them a chance to prove it very quick. But of course the responsible leaders of the party will not do it. They would rather hide behind an anonymous libel which they know to be false, and put forward notorious cranks and professional liars to do the dirty work they are willing to profit by. The work they are engaged in is morally as base as uttering forged paper or passing counterfeit money, the only difference being that the latter would subject them to a legal penalty. But some men regulate their moral principles by the penal code, and regard everything as honorable that is not punished by fine and imprisonment.

The Journal suggested Hon. Joseph E. McDonald or the Hon. William H. English because they are reputable, responsible Democrats of national reputation. Mr. English declines to become the custodian of the two thousand-dollar check, and it will, therefore, be tendered to day to the Hon. Joseph E. McDonald, who was not in the city yesterday. The Journal is determined that the country shall know whether any representative Democrat or Democratic organization will back up the charges that are being circulated for partisan purposes. Mr. Taggart and Mr. Sheerin decline to touch the unclean thing, publicly. Mr. Jewett has not been heard from. He was, possibly, out of the city, preparing a fac-simile of the receipt given by a young, inexperienced country lawyer for a fee of \$20,000 paid him for no service whatever, at a time when a relative was on the bench of the court in which a case was pending that deeply interested the very liberal clients.

Now is as good a time as any to have it understood, right here in Indianapolis, that Democratic bulldozing don't go. It has been the studied purpose of the Democrats to march by Republican headquarters with insulting transparencies, and when any Democrat got uncomfortably full of bad whisky to make himself obnoxious around the Republican committee-rooms. It has become the habit of Democratic patrolmen to impudently interfere with peaceable citizens, and of the postoffice bumpkins to yell insulting epithets at Republican parades. The Journal

desires to say that there has been enough of this sort of thing, and it must stop. The Republicans of Indianapolis are peaceable and law-abiding, but they do not propose to be tramped upon and run over. There is plenty of room in Indianapolis for the peaceably disposed of all parties; there is not room enough for the riotously-disposed of any party.

THE CHICAGO INTER-OCEAN SAYS:

"The speeches delivered almost daily by General Harrison are short enough, so that they are quite generally read and are doing a great deal to set public sentiment in running in the right direction on the live political questions of the day, but he has shown himself especially competent to grasp and handle intelligently the financial or business features of current state-manship."

The current number of the Journal contains a portrait and biographical sketch of Alva Eugene Davis, the manager of the American Magazine. Mr. Davis is a native of Hendricks county, Indiana, and a graduate of the Indiana University. He is not a writer, but a business man, and in addition to the care of the magazine has charge of the book-publishing department of Frank Leslie's. He was recently requested by the American Protective Tariff League to formulate a plan for placing that league on a permanent basis, and especially to take charge of their weekly paper, and put it on a foundation which would ensure its publication for years to come. His suggestions were immediately accepted and he has charge of that, too.

Protests against the car stove have already made their annual appearance in the newspapers. They are a little in advance of the stove itself, but the latter will soon be fired up and ready for business at the old stands.

QUEER things creep into the newspapers these days. Here is the Philadelphia Press referring seriously to "Samuel Leffingwell, a workman in Indiana." "It is enough to make a horse laugh."

The straw hat has put on its out-of-season expression and the watermelon begins to lose its charm.

To the Editor of the Indianapolis Journal: Did Dr. Fletcher, ex-superintendent of the Indianapolis hospital, who was so summarily removed from that position by the Democratic board of the account of his opposition to the corrupt management of that institution, declare his intention of supporting Harrison for President? Knowing that it is an honest man, a gentleman and an enemy to all corrupt doings, and knowing, as he does, the corrupt manner in which the Democrats have managed the State institutions, including the Prison South, I should think he would not content himself to simply announce his intention of supporting the Republican ticket but would be active in placing better men in their places. W. M. S.

Dr. Fletcher has not only declared his intention of supporting the Republican ticket but is making strong campaign speeches and otherwise assisting in the overthrow of the corrupt Democracy.

To the Editor of the Indianapolis Journal: 1. What was the bonded indebtedness of the United States at the close of Buchanan's administration? 2. Did citizens of the United States hold the bonds? 3. What rate of interest was the government then paying? A READER.

The public debt in 1856, when Buchanan was elected, was \$31,972,537. In 1860 it had increased to \$64,842,287, and on the 1st of January, 1861, four months before he went out of office, it was \$90,589,573. 2. There is no means of ascertaining where or by whom the bonds were held. 3. The government paid as high as 10 and 12 percent interest on loans made in the last year of Buchanan's administration.

To the Editor of the Indianapolis Journal: Can a married woman, who is living with her husband, hold a commission and act as postmaster? Some say she can, and some say not, and I would like to know the truth in the matter. N. D. P. M. S.

She can. She must, however, receive such appointment and give bond in her Christian name, and not her husband's, as for instance, Mrs. Mary Smith, and not Mrs. John Smith.

To the Editor of the Indianapolis Journal: Please state in the Journal (daily) whether or not Sherman or Sheridan sent a telegram to headquarters, or anywhere else, to the effect that Hovey was a coward, or that he objected to such a man as Hovey being sent to the front in the army. Democrats circulate the report very industriously, and I want to know the truth. CARTRIDGE, Ind. R. E. CLARK.

Neither one did so. It is a campaign lie.

To the Editor of the Indianapolis Journal: Please to give name of person and place who said: "Not another man or another dollar will I support this unholty war." Was it Dan Voorhees? THROCKMORTON, Ind. H. W.

It was reported to have been said by Daniel W. Voorhees in a speech made at Greencastle during the war.

POLITICAL NOTE AND COMMENT.

THE Groverville (N. Y.) Daily Leader, an independent newspaper with Democratic tendencies, is supporting the straight Republican ticket, national and State.

The Harrisburg Patriot states that Chas. S. Wolfe, prohibition candidate for Governor of Pennsylvania in 1886, has decided to support Cleveland and Thurman.

EX-SECRETARY OF WAR ROBERT T. LINCOLN will stump New Hampshire for the Republicans under the auspices of the Lincoln League, which was named after his father.

In one of Warner Miller's eloquent pleas for some restriction of the saloons, he said that the number of saloons in New York State have increased until now there was one saloon to every 100 persons in the State.

THE Amsterdam (N. Y.) Democrat says: "Ex-Public Printer Clapp, the veteran political observer, has been abroad in New York for some time and is satisfied that Harrison's majority will not be less than 30,000."

THERE is nothing that would cause such a vast shrinkage in the value of farm property of this country as free trade. The destruction of home markets would reduce farm profits and multiply farm mortgages.—Iowa State Register.

In speaking at New York on the political situation, Dr. McGivney said he would vote for Warner Miller for Governor, and for the thirty-four Republican presidential electors, because they were in favor of and represented protection.

ROGER Q. MILLS REVIEWED.

His Theories and Sophistries Treated by a Master in Reasoning and Debate.

The Hon. John M. Butler Entertains a Large and Enthusiastic Audience with a Scathing Speech on Free-Trade Pretensions.

There was frost in the air last night and no fire in Tomlinson Hall, but that did not deter 3,000 people from going to the hall and listening for two hours and a half to a political argument by Hon. John M. Butler. "It was one of the best political meetings that has been held in Indianapolis this year. The speech of Mr. Butler was in answer to that of Roger Q. Mills, who occupied the hall one week ago. It was delivered in Mr. Butler's well-known forcible style, and, by all who heard it, was pronounced as a more than sufficient answer to the great free-trade apostle. Although devoted almost entirely to the tariff question, the large audience was interested throughout. Every person present remained until the last sentence was uttered, at 10:30 o'clock. The audience was composed principally of laboring men, and their applause was frequent. A feature of the meeting was the excellent vocal music furnished by the gentlemen's Harmon and Morton club, led by Captain Richardson. George Merritt, the woolen goods manufacturer, presided. In announcing Mr. Butler as the speaker of the evening he said he was a man who needed no introduction to an Indianapolis audience. Mr. Butler was loudly applauded when he stepped forward to speak. He said:

Ladies and Gentlemen—One week to-morrow night I had the pleasure of hearing in this room Hon. Roger Q. Mills, a representative Democrat, who claims to represent his party upon the great issues of the day. Without any preliminary whatever, I propose to address myself to an answer to the proposition advanced by him. In the first place, I admit with Mr. Mills that the present campaign involves great, and, to use his words, vital interests, and that the American laborer is mightily interested in the issue of the present campaign; that his welfare is somehow or other to be affected for weal or for woe by the manner in which the decision shall be registered at the ballot-box on the 6th of November. Mr. Mills then asks who is interested in the issue. The tree, he said, is to be judged by the fruit. As a representative Republican for the time being I accept the test, and am ready for the measurement. Mr. Mills says that the Democratic party has been the friend of the poor man and the laborer. I deny it. [Applause.] And not one word, or letter, or line, or syllable of proof in support of that proposition was advanced by Mr. Mills. He seems to have taken that for granted and proceeds to ask "What has the Republican party done for the laborer?" I am ready to answer, much in every way. The Republican party has given dignity to labor, and has recognized the manhood of the laborer.

Why, the Republican party has recognized the irrepressible conflict between right and wrong, between the laborer and his oppressor, between freedom and slavery, between Union and secession. [Applause.] The glory of the Republican party—the very crowning glory of its history—is that at its very zenith the shackles fell from the limbs of the slaves. Labor was freed, manhood was recognized, and development and growth took the place of stagnation and decay, and prosperity and plenty took the place of poverty and want. The Republican party, with a sneer, that the Republicans controlled this government for twenty-five years; and they are the brightest years in all history. [Great applause.]

What has the Republican party done? Why, it has given to the American laborer a country, a government, a home, a head, it has given to him a currency, a stable, fixed money, that makes his wages absolutely safe and secure. It is by the protection that it has given to American industries and American production that it has secured a market for the laborer that his country, by its growth and development, has outstripped any nation named in the world; and so far outstripped all nations that it now has a market which greener-eyed England looks at with envy and longing, and by the aid of the British Democracy hopes to lay its hands on. [Applause.] One of the best compliments that I ever knew to be paid to any party, to any political organization, was paid to the Republican party recently by the London Times, and describing the difference between Republicans and Democrats in the United States in their manner of government control and management, and it said:

The object of Republican statesmen is to secure the largest amount of wealth for their country generally, but it is by any means possible to keep up a standard of comfort among the laboring classes. [Applause.]

Now let me ask a question that Mr. Mills did not answer. What has the Democratic party done for the laborer that the country has benefited thereby? He failed utterly to attempt to answer that question; he must excuse me if I answer it for him. [Laughter.] For nearly a century it crushed him beneath a rotten, worthless currency in which his hard-earned earnings melted away and turned to water in his grasp. It belittled in labor without reward, and it formed an aristocracy based upon human bondage and supported by the products of slave labor. It delighted, without reward, in the here before the who heard, and I have heard, Democratic orators on this soil of Indiana, call the laborers of this country mudsills of society. It looked down upon the laborer as a parasite, and upon the laborer as an ignoble. In 1861 the Democratic party of this country was confronted by a condition as well as a theory. [Applause.] The condition was a Republican administration presided over by Abraham Lincoln, himself a laborer. [Applause.] The theory was that slavery should be confined within the limits of the Southern States, and that everywhere else in our domain labor should have its just reward, and the manhood of the laborer should be recognized. The Democratic party refused to abide the condition and to accept the theory. It inaugurated a war of devastation and pillage for the express purpose of destroying our government and founding upon its ruins a Confederacy whose two corner-stones should be human slavery and opposition to tariff protection. [Great applause.] Oh, yes, the Democratic party has done this. It has always been the laborer's friend. The tree, you know, is to be judged by the fruit; so Mills said. [Laughter and applause.] When I have heard and bear me witness that I have not without provocation gone into a reference even to the war period, Mr. Mills provided that reference and challenged an examination of it. [Applause.] Mr. Mills's second proposition was that the Republican party, after the war was over, did wrong in repealing the internal revenue tax, saying that they ought to have repealed the tariff tax instead. When did the Democratic party become the champion of internal-revenue taxes? Why the change of front? How was it during the war? Why every man within the sound of my voice remembers the howl of Democratic speakers, during the war, about the tax-gatherers being at every poor man's door, in all this country, and taking everything he had, and saying there was no love for the internal-revenue system then, and there is no love for it to-day. It is not because the Democratic party loves the internal-revenue system of taxation more, but because it hates tariff protection more than it hates internal-revenue taxation. Since the close of the war the Democratic party and the Republican party each have been in power in the lower House in Congress just eleven years. The Republican party passed eight laws repealing internal-revenue taxes, and the Democratic party has passed one law repealing internal-revenue taxes. It has passed four laws reducing tariff revenue, and by those four laws it took of \$75,000,000 tariff taxation, \$302,000,000 of annual taxation. The Democratic party in their eleven years have reduced internal-revenue taxes just \$6,000,000, and they did not reduce tariff taxes one penny. There is no doubt, though, but what they are the friend of the laborer. [Laughter.] What have we left just four articles paying any internal-revenue tax, liquor, tobacco, national banks and bogue butter. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Mills's third complaint is—I will read his words as I took them from his lips—that the Republican party left two thousand million dollars of debt to be paid by tariff taxation, and this burden falls on the poor man and the laborer. Now that is suggestive. Who caused the debt? [Great applause.] The Republican party didn't cause it. The debt at one time was 2,700 million dollars, and it was caused by the Democratic party. Roger Q. Mills made one of the chief causes. This entire debt was created by that choice friend of the laborer and the poor man, the Democratic party. [Laughter and applause.] The next complaint of Mr. Mills was that the Republican party didn't repudiate the war debt. I want to ask any Democrat, would the repudiation of the war debt have aided anything to the comfort and credit of our country? Mr. Mills's next complaint was that the Republican

The Times So Short.

It isn't worth while for a Democrat to take a postoffice now even if there were one left for him.